

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Replacement sheets are included as part of this response, the replacement sheets comprising clean-copies incorporating amendments to corresponding Figures 5-6, 11-12, 14-15, and 31. In particular, replacement sheets for Figures 5-6, 11-12, and 31 omit reference numbers and associated bracketing or reference lines that are not referenced in the specification, whereas replacement sheets for Figures 14 and 15 insert reference numbers and associated reference lines for features referenced in the specification.

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding final office action dated May 28, 2010. Through this response, claims 75, 77-79, 82, 92, 97, and 99 have been amended, and claims 76, 83, and 93-94 have been canceled without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and pending claims 75, 77-79, 82, 84-92, and 95-99 are respectfully requested.

I. Allowable Subject Matter

Page 18 of the final Office Action indicates that claims 83 and 93 are allowable if rewritten in independent form including all limitations of any intervening claims. Applicants appreciate the indication of allowability. In the interest of advancing the case to allowance, Applicants have amended independent claim 75 to incorporate the features of allowable claim 83 and intervening claim 76, and independent claim 92 has been amended to incorporate the features of allowable claim 93 (and further incorporates processor language). Independent claim 94 has been canceled without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims.

II. Claim Objections

Claims 83 and 93 have been objected to for depending on a respective, rejected base claim. As set forth in Section I above, Applicants have incorporated the features of claims 83 and 93 into their respective independent claims, and hence believe these amendments to render the objection moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection be withdrawn.

III. Specification Amendments

Various amendments have been made to the specification through this response to correct typographical and grammatical errors and maintain consistency between the specification and figures. Although these amendments effect several changes to the specification, no new matter has been added.

IV. Drawing Amendments

Various amendments have been made to the drawings through this response to correct maintain consistency between the specification and figures. For instance, replacement sheets are included as part of this response, the replacement sheets comprising clean-copies incorporating amendments to corresponding Figures 5-6, 11-12, 14-15, and 31. In particular, replacement sheets for Figures 5-6, 11-12, and 31 omit reference numbers and associated bracketing or reference lines that are not referenced in the specification, whereas replacement sheets for Figures 14 and 15 insert reference numbers and associated reference lines for features referenced in the specification. Although these amendments effect several changes to the specification, no new matter has been added.

V. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

A. Statement of the Rejection

1. Claims 75-79, 84, 92, and 95-99 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over *Hoang* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,557,030) in view of *Kusaba et al.* ("*Kusaba*," U.S. Pat. No. 6,510,556), *Lett et al.* ("*Lett*," U.S. Patent No. 5,592,551), and *Hicks, III et al.* ("*Hicks*," U.S. Pat. Public. No. 20040261112).

2. Claim 82 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over *Hoang* in view of *Kusaba*, *Lett*, and *Hicks*, and further in view of *Okamoto et al.* (“*Okamoto*,” U.S. Pat. No. 6,901,385).

3. Claims 85-87 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over *Hoang* in view of *Kusaba*, *Lett*, and *Hicks*, and further in view of *Ellis et al.* (“*Ellis*,” U.S. Pat. Public. No. 20030188313).

4. Claims 88-90 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over *Hoang* in view of *Kusaba*, *Lett*, and *Hicks*, and further in view of *Hunter et al.* (“*Hunter*,” U.S. Pat. Public. No. 20020056118).

5. Claim 91 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over *Hoang* in view of *Kusaba*, *Lett*, and *Hicks*, and *Hunter*, and further in view of *Philips* (U.S. Pat. Public. No. 20020069412) and *Tomita et al.* (“*Tomita*,” U.S. Pat. No. 6,732,372).

6. Claim 94 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over *Hunter* in view of *Tomita*.

Though Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejections indicated above and described in pages 2-18 of the final Office Action, in the interest of advancing the case to allowance, Applicants have amended independent claims 75 and 92 to incorporate allowable claim features. In that the rejections are now believed to be rendered moot by amendment and/or cancellation of the various claims as set forth above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the pending claims.

VI. Canceled Claims

As identified above, claims 76, 83, and 93-94 have been canceled from the application through this response without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer. Applicants reserve the right to present these canceled claims, or variants thereof, in continuing applications that may be filed subsequently.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants' pending claims are in condition for allowance. Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and official notice, and similarly interpreted statements, should not be considered well known since the Office Action does not include specific factual findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 28, 2010

By: /David Rodack/
David Rodack, Reg. No. 47,034

Merchant & Gould
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-9946
Telephone: 404.954.5049

